DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 716 UD 013 479

AUTHOR	Stavros, Denny
TITLE	The Evaluation of the School-Community Agents Project, 1971-1972.
INSTITUTION	Detroit Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Research and Development.
PUB DATE	Oct 72
NOTE	36p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Community Involvement; Data Analysis; *Educational Disadvantagement; Educational Objectives; Evaluation Criteria; *Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Pupil Personnel Services; Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I

ABSTRACT

Beginning with the 1970-1971 school year, the School Community Agents program underwent a major restructuring of its functions and purposes so that operations would more closely conform to ESEA Title I guidelines. Agent role functions have been coordinated toward raising the academic level of students, using two major innovations. These two structural and procedural innovations were: (1) the creation of a small group of students (target group), with the student selection based upon criteria fundamental to the scope and purpose of compensatory education in each of the Agent Schools; once selected these students would form the core group for whom a range of intensive services and activities would be provided by the Agents; and (2) the development of an educational team at the local school level. It is thus contended that more emphasis could be placed on involving more of the parents of target group students in the range of activities and services. (Author/DM)

FORM 6510

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076716

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE EVALUATION OF THE SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT

1971-1972

Funded under Title I of the Elementary
and Secondary Education Act

Documents, data, and additional tables supporting the findings of this evaluation are on file and available for examination in the office of the evaluator.

---

by

Denny Stavros
Research Associate (Title I)

The Research and Development Department
Program Evaluation Section
(Funded under Title I, ESEA)
Detroit Public Schools
October 1972

UD 013479

THE EVALUATION OF THE SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT

Description of the Program

Beginning with the 1970-1971 school year, the School-Community Agents Program has undergone a major restructuring of its functions and a redefinition of its purposes so that its constituent operations would more closely conform to ESEA Title I guidelines. The central principle which has guided the refocusing of Agent activities has been that Agent role functions be coordinated toward raising the academic level of students. To best facilitate this more direct participation in the local school's academic program--which, to be sure, falls short of assuming any of the responsibilities traditionally prescribed to the classroom teacher, two structural and procedural innovations were developed. The first was the creation of a small group of students, named the target group, with the selection of students for this group based upon criteria fundamental to the scope and purpose of compensatory education, in each of the Agent schools. Once selected these students would form the core group for whom a range of intensive services and activities would be provided directly or indirectly by the Agents. Because of the unique character of the Agent's office, the Agent, beyond the environs of the classroom, is able to coordinate services and both facilitate and focus other's behavior toward establishing sets of conditions thought to be helpful to the students in achieving more satisfactory levels of academic performance. The second innovation was the development of an educational team at the local school level. While there has been variation in the size and composition, of educational teams, which has also been the case in size of the different target groups, nonetheless, these teams have reflected an attempt to draw from a

diversity of persons directly involved in the students' welfare.[1] In most cases, the educational team has functioned in the selection of target group members, but more importantly, the educational team members have assisted the Agent in the determination of student needs and the development of treatment strategies in the form of services and activities to be provided the target group students. In a sense, the Agents' role vis-a-vis the educational team is one of acting as a catalyst by tapping the resources represented in the array of offices of educational team member for the benefit of the students as well as standing as an active embodiment of the raison d'etre of the educational team. However, in actual performance, most of the responsibility for determining and implementing treatment strategies falls upon the agent.

If the operation of the School-Community Agents Project during the 1970-1971 school year may be characterized as transitional, i.e., a period of testing and developing new role definitions, establishing operational methodologies and working out implementation strategies, the project's operation during the 1971-1972 school year may be viewed as the first year of total functioning.

---

[1]For example, educational teams have included, apart from administrative and faculty representation, many of the following persons: school nurses, school social workers, parents, school-community assistants, school psychologists, reading coordinators, curriculum leaders, teacher aids, attendance teachers, teacher union representative, and speech therapists.

Program Objectives

Efficacy of the School-Community Agents Project is tied to three stated objectives. These are:

1. Raise the achievement level of target group students.

2. Increase the participation of target group students in school activities not directly a part of classroom instruction.

3. Increase the participation of target group students' parents in school related affairs and in activities related to improving their competency to deal with problems.

In terms of measuring the Project's success in reaching these objectives, the following specific objectives were tested:

1. Elementary level target group students will show a mean gain of nine grade equivalent units in reading and math for the nine months between taking the Title I pre- and posttests.

2. Secondary level target group students will show a significant increase in mean grade point averages between the June, 1971 and June, 1972 card markings.

3. Twenty-five per cent of target group students will show an improvement between June, 1971 and June, 1972 in number of days absent, number of times tardy, and in higher citizenship grades.

4. A higher percentage of target group students will participate in various activities and will be recipients of various services in the 1971-1972 school year as compared to the 1970-1971 school year.

5. A higher percentage of target group students' parents will participate in school related affairs and activities and in activities related to improving their competency to deal with problems in the 1971-1972 school year as compared to the 1970-1971 school year.

Evaluation Procedures

The evaluation design focused on four categories of data:

1. Student activities and services, including tutoring,
2. Student scores derived from the Title I Testing Program, May, 1971 and April, 1972,
3. Student grades, attendance information, and citizenship marks,
4. Parent activities and services.

With the exception of Title I test scores (the second category above), all data used in this evaluation report were derived from the information compiled by the Agents on the "Student Garget Group Data Form."[1]

Pre- and posttest scores from the Title I Testing Program used in this report were derived from an overall 20 percent stratified,probability sample taken for all ESEA Title I projects. An analysis of the total sample of pre- and posttest scores will be undertaken and will be available following the publication of this report.

Analysis of the Data: Sample Size and Demographic Data

Table 1 displays the number of students per target group for each Agent school grouped by school level and school year. In contrast to the 1970-1971 school year where information was provided from 19 of 39 Agents schools for data processing (see footnote 1 in this table), all but one of the Agents schools in the current (1971-1972)school year provided data. This difference

[1]This form, a 8½ x 11" card, represents a revision of the form used for the previous year's evaluation with a somewhat different format on the face side for primary and secondary level school target groups, respectively. In addition to the revision of the data form, the procedure for processing the information recorded on this form was modified so that there was a direct transfer of information from the data forms to computer coding sheets, rather than transferring information to a series of tabulation sheets-- prior to recording for computer processing.

Table 1

Size of Target Groups for 1971-72 and 1970-71 School Years Per School by School Level and Region*

Elementary Level Schools	Number of Students Per Target Group 1971-72	1970-71	Secondary Level Schools	Number of Students Per Target Group 1971-72	1970-71
Region 1			Region 1		
Balch	33	(23)[3]	Hutchins	29	(39)[3]
Burton	23	38	Jefferson	24	(17)[3]
Chaney	21	25	Knudsen	42	(39)[3]
Couzens	34	32	Pelham	25	(44)[3]
Campbell	36	34	Sherrard	64	60
Dwyer	20	(26)[1]	Spain	50	(37)[3]
Edmonson	16	(16)[3]	Murray-Wright	18	(26)[3]
Ferry	19	23	Northeastern	13	(20)[3]
Franklin	47	(70)[3]	Northern	29	(27)[3]
George	22	33			
Kennedy	20	15	Region 2		
Moore	19	24	McMichael	22	30
Owen	18	16	Northwestern	(33)[5]	
Williams	33	56	Region 6		
Region 8			Cleveland	23	(12)[3]
Bellevue	39	79			
Bunche[2]		41	Region 8		
Duffield	75	43	Barbour	37	(42)[3]
Harris	49	54	Miller	65	(128)[3]
Jones	29	(25)[1]	M.L.King	12	(29)[3]
Keating	33				
Marcy[2]		37	Total	458[4]	90[4]
Pingree	40	21			
Scripps	32	47			
Total	658	618[4]			

*The size of the 1971-72 Target Groups represents the number of students used as the basis for data processing in this report. An additional 42 students at the elementary level who either left, dropped out, or transferred before June, 1972 were not included in the data analysis. It should be noted, however, that a considerable amount of Agent time, in the form of services provided and in direct contact made, was given over to these 42 students, e.g., 23 received tutoring services.

The size of each of the 1970-71 Target Groups, not including figures in parenthesis, was taken from last year's evaluation report and represents the number for whom data were available on student activities and services, see "The Evaluation or One School-Community Agents Project, 1970-1971, "December, 1971, Table 1, page 6.

is reflected in the number of students who comprise the total sample, and specifically in the disparity in total numbers at the secondary level.

Table 2

Number and Per Cent of Target Group Students Conforming to Each of Ten Selection Criteria by School Level

Selection Criteria	Elementary Level (N=658) (N)	Per Cent	Secondary Level (N=458) (N)	Per Cent
One or More Years Retarded in Reading Achievement	(505)	77	(333)	72
One or More Years Retarded in Math Achievement	(462)	70	(266)	58
Ten or More Days Absent per Semester	(261)	40	(177)	39
One or More Years Overage in Grade Placement	(153)	23	(122)	27
One or More Police Contacts	(119)	18	(85)	18
Three or More School Counselor contacts regarding disciplinary action	(105)	23	(151)	33
Member of a Low Income Family	(373)	57	(182)	40
Negative Attitude Toward School and Self	(127)	19	(90)	20
Emotional and Social Instability	(160)	24	(46)	10
Member of a One-Parent Family	(173)	26	(63)	14

[1]Information on the number of target group students in these two elementary school, 1970-71, was derived from a listing of target group Title I testing numbers. Students from these two schools were included in the summary of Title I test scores in the 1970-71 Evaluation Report, ibid., Table 3, p.11.

[2]The omission of Target group numbers for the Bunche and Marcy schools 1971-72, is explained by the non-replacement at mid-year of the agent in the former school who left the Detroit Schools to take on another position, and the non-replacement in the latter school where the Agent position was vacant during the entire 1971-72 school year.

[3]Information on the number of target group students in these schools was derived from various listings of target group students submitted by Agents during the 1970-71 school year.

[4]Figures in parentheses are not included in the total.

[5]No data were available, and thus this group of target students was not included in the present report.

Total sample for the current school year is 1116; for the previous school year, total sample ranged from 600 to 634 or slightly more, depending upon the specific type of data processed. The widest variation in subsample size is at the secondary level where information was available last year for 90 target group students as compared to 458 target group students for the current year.

As may be observed in Table 2, roughly three-fourths of both elementary and secondary level target group students were one or more years retarded in reading achievement. However, in math achievement retardation, there was a spread of 12 percentage points between the two school level groups. On three of the other seven selection criteria, that is, ten-plus days absent (last year), police contracts, negative attitudes, the two school level groups had similar proportions.

For the remaining five criteria, a slightly higher percentage of secondary level target group students were overage in grade placement, and an even larger percentage difference separated the two groups in counselor contacts, while higher proportions of elementary level students were characterized by one-parent family membership, emotional and social instability, and membership in a low income family. That the elementary level target group students are slightly more disadvantaged can also be inferred from the following breakdown of family socio-occupational status:

	Elementary Level (N=491)		Secondary Level (N=395)	
	(N)	Per Cent	(N)	Per Cent)
Parent or Guardian Gainfully Employed	(225)	46	(205)	52
Parent or Guardian Receiving Some Type of Assistance, e.g., ADC, Pension.	(260)	53	(147)	37
Parent or Guardian Unemployed, Laid Off, Disabled, etc.	(6)	1	(43)	11

It is of interest to note that approximately one-fourth of the elementary level students were born outside of Detroit or Michigan in contrast to approximately one-fifth of the secondary level students. (No cross-tabulations were run between birthplace and other demographic variable.) Sixty per cent of elementary level target group students are males in comparison to seventy-one per cent males in the secondary group. Average age in the former group was ten, and in the latter group, fourteen.

Achievement of the Project's Objectives

Objective: To Raise the Achievement Level of Target Group Students

1. Elementary level target group students will show a mean gain of nine grade equivalent units in reading and math for the nine months between taking the Title I pre- and posttests.

Data measuring growth in academic performance are presented in Table 3. (As noted above, these data or test score results were derived from a twenty per cent stratified probability sample of all ESEA Title I project populations.) By inspection of Table 3, it is observed that the sample elementary level target group students met or exceeded the performance criterion (mean gain of nine months or .9 in the last column of Table 3) for grades three, four, and six in reading and for grades four, five, and six in math. The extremes in achievement parallel the upper and lower limits in grade placement: in the second grade, posttest gains were less than expected on both tests, while at the sixth grade level, the differences between pre- and posttest means were in excess by six and nine months for reading and math, respectively.[1]

[1]Although the Title I Testing Program was confined to grades one through six in ESEA Title I schools, pre- and posttest scores on standardized tests for a small sample of target group students were tabulated by Agents in two secondary schools: Sherrard and Pelham. These data will be included in the analysis of Title I Testing results following the publication of this report.

Table 3

Pre- and Posttest Grade Equivalent Mean Scores and Differences between Scores on Reading and Math Subtests for Grades One through Six

Grade	Subject Area of Subtest	Sample Size (N)	Pretest GE Mean Score[a]	Posttest GE Mean Score[b]	Pre- and Posttest Difference
One	Reading	30		1.7	
	Math	30		1.6	
Two	Reading	47	1.7	2.4	.7
	Math	53	1.7	2.5	.8
Three	Reading	90	2.0	2.9	.9
	Math	89	2.1	2.9	.8
Four	Reading	103	2.4	3.6	1.2
	Math	80	2.6	3.8	1.2
Five	Reading	161	3.3	4.1	.8
	Math	160	3.3	4.4	1.1
Six	Reading	96	3.2	4.7	1.5
	Math	90	3.4	5.2	1.8

[a]Title I Testing Program, May 1971
[b]Title I Testing Program, April 1972

2. Secondary level target group students will show a significant increase in grade point averages between the June, 1971 and June, 1972 card markings.

On the basis of final or last card marks for June 1971, January 1972 and June 1972, grade point averages (GPA) were computed and statistical comparisons were made for secondary level students. Results from a Related t-Test comparing June 1971 GPA with January 1971 GPA for the same students showed no difference statistically, see display below. However, on comparison of GPAs between January 1972 and June 1972 and between June 1971 and June 1972 differences between means were positive and statistically significant. In letter grade equivalents, the GPA mean in June 1971 was a weak C-, while in June 1972, the GPA mean was closer to a weak C.

Card Marking Period	GPA Mean	t-Value	df	P
June 1971	1.65	..27	360	NS
January 1972	1.66			
January 1972	1.69	3.59	338	.001
June 1972	1.83			
June 1971	1.67	3.29	332	.001
June 1972	1.80			

With regard to end of semester promotions, 88 per cent of 360 students were promoted in June 1971, 98 per cent in January 1972 and 82 per cent in June 1972. For elementary level students, 92 per cent were promoted in June 1972; although among those successfully promoted, there was a small number of conditional promotions.

3. Twenty-five per cent of target group students will show an improvement between June 1971 and June 1972 in number of days absent, number of times tardy, and in higher citizenship grades.

Fifty-one per cent of elementary level target group students for whom data were available (N=606) were absent a fewer number of days during the 1971-1972 school year as compared to the 1970-1971 school year. Forty-six per cent (N=579) were tardy a lesser number of times for the same comparison school years. Fifty-six per cent showed no change in citizenship grade, twenty-two per cent improved, and twenty-two per cent received a lower citizenship grade (N=558). (Citizenship grades were derived from an average of all such grades and was most usually recorded as a numerical unit.) In passing it should be noted that eighty-four per cent of elementary level target group students (N=618) received an average or better-than-average citizenship grade in June 1972.

Improvements in attendance among the secondary level target group students were of similar order as that recorded for those at the elementary level. Comparison between the semester ending June 1971 and the semester

January 1972 showed that 50 per cent (N=371) were absent a fewer number of days and 44 per cent (N=339) were tardy a lesser number of times. For the semester ending January 1972 only 33 per cent (N=302) were absent a fewer number of days and the same percentage (N=268) were tardy a lesser number of times. However, percentages based on a comparison between both spring semesters (June 1972 with June 1971) found 47 per cent (N=348) with fewer absences and 45 per cent (N=243) with a lesser number of days tardy.

Using an citizenship index for the final card marking in each of three semesters ending in June 1971, January 1972 and June 1972, respectively, the following results were obtained in testing for difference between means:

Card Marking Period	Citizenship Index Mean*	t-Value	df	P
June 1971	2.17	2.44	351	.015
Jan. 1972	2.10			
Jan. 1972	2.10	2.39	364	.017
June 1972	2.05			
June 1971	2.18	4.08	345	.001
June 1972	2.06			

*A lower value represents a higher citizenship mark.

In each test, the difference was positive and statistically significant.

Information for an additional citizenship measure, number of contacts with guidance counselor, was gathered. However, such information was available for less than one-third of the secondary level students. In a comparison of the number of such contacts for the two spring semesters (1972 with 1971) it was found that there was no change in the frequency for 44 per cent, and an equal per cent of students had fewer or had more guidance counselor contacts.

Table 4

Number and Per Cent of Target Group Students who Participated in or Were Recipients of Various Activities and Services By Activity and Service Category and School Level; 1970-1971 Percentage Total[1] By Corresponding Activity and Service Categories

Activities and Services	Elementary Level Students (N)	Elementary Level Students Per Cent	Secondary Level Students (N)	Secondary Level Students Per Cent	Combined Total Per Cent	Combined 1970-71 Total Per Cent
In-School Extra-Curricular and Service Activities						
Teacher Helper	(159)	24	(46)	10	18	13
Organized School-Wide Service	(74)	11	(17)	4	8	8
School Club Participation	(104)	16	(106)	23	19	18
School Assembly, Science Fair, Police Circus, etc.	(183)	28	(267)	58	40	13
Extra-Curricular Study						
After School Reading Program, Home Tutoring	(29)	4	(11)	2	4	4
Modification of Anti-Social Behavior						
Group Worker Counseling	(102)	16	(31)	7	10	5
Participation in a Treatment Group	(112)	17	(9)	2	11	12
Psychological Testing	(39)	6	(16)	4	5	3
Other Diagnostic Services	(14)	2	(11)	2	2	
Various Counseling Services: Social Worker, Personal	(163)	25	(67)	15	21	

Table 4 (Cont.)

Activities and Services	Elementary Level Students (N)	Elementary Level Students Per Cent	Secondary Level Students (N)	Secondary Level Students Per Cent	Combined Total Per Cent	Combined 1970-71 Total Per Cent
Socializing Experiences						
Spectator at a Sports Event	(143)	22	(190)	41	30	12
Participant in a Sports Activity	(141)	21	(101)	22	22	13
Parent-Student Dinner, School Dance	(93)	14	(148)	32	13	23
Weekend Trip, Camp, Bob-Lo Outing, etc.	(226)	34	(76)	17	27	24
Formal Organizational Participation	(71)	11	(43)	9	10	3
Medical Services						
Medical Examination (Including vision screening, etc.)	(182)	28	(129)	28	28	15
Treatment (including speech and hearing)	(37)	6	(24)	5	5	2
Prosthesis (including Eye Glasses)	(16)	2	(16)	4	3	3
Dental Services						
Examination	(155)	24	(42)	9	18	6
Treatment	(84)	13	(33)	7	10	3
Prosthesis	(1)	*	(3)	1	*	*
Other Activities and Services						
Ad-Hoc School Activities (Bake Sale, Car Wash, Clean-up Campaign, Fashion Show,etc.)	(33)	5	(78)	17	10	
Special Classes (Sewing Class, Career guidance, Black History, Math Lab,etc.)	(43)	6	(28)	6	6	
Recipient of Gifts, Clothing, Food	(5)	1	(0)	0	*	
Miscellaneous Activities	(75)	11	(80)	17	14	
Total (N)	(658)		(458)		(1116)	(708)

*Less than 1 per cent

[1]Combined Elementary and Secondary level students

4. A higher percentage of target group students will participate in various activities and will be recipients of various services in the 1971-1972 school year as compared to the 1970-1971 school year.

During the 1970-1971 school year, twenty-three per cent of the aggregate target group students in eighteen schools (from which data were provided) did not participate nor were recipients of activities or services facilitated through Agent efforts. By contrast, only nine per cent of the student target group aggregate from thirty-five schools during the current school year were uninvolved in such activities and services.

A breakdown of student participation by specific activities and services categories is presented in Table 4 together with combined percentage totals for the two comparisons years.[1] In addition to a higher percentage of student target group participation in activities and reception of services during the current school year, there is also an apparent increase in percentages per activity or per service category. Not only does this apply to comparison, between the combined totals for the two school years, see the last two columns in Table 4, but also to comparisons between the distribution for elementary level students (1971-1972) with that of the 1970-71 combined total, since in this latter group, the great majority are elementary level students.

Distribution of the number and per cent per number of activities and services for elementary and secondary target group students is presented in Table 5. For both groups the median number is four.

5. A higher percentage of target group students' parents will participate in school related affairs and activities and in activities related to improving their competency to deal with problems in the 1971-1972 school year as compared to the 1970-1971 school.

[1]See Tables 9 and 10 in the appendix for a similar breakdown (1971-1972 data), but organized by Agent schools.

Table 5

Sum of Activities and Services Per Number and Per Cent of Target Group by School Level

Sum of Activities and Services	Elementary Level Students (N)	Elementary Level Students Per Cent	Secondary Level Students (N)	Secondary Level Students Per Cent	Combined Total Per Cent
None	(49)	7	(51)	11	9
One	(68)	10	(66)	14	12
Two	(117)	18	(80)	17	18
Three	(109)	17	(78)	17	17
Four	(124)	19	(52)	11	16
Five	(77)	12	(38)	8	10
Six	(72)	11	(28)	6	9
Seven	(19)	3	(24)	5	4
Eight	(10)	2	(14)	3	2
Nine	(6)	1	(14)	3	2
Ten	(2)	*	(9)	2	1
Eleven	(3)	*	(3)	1	*
Twelve	(1)	*	(2)	*	*
Sixteen	(0)	0	(0)	0	0
Seventeen	(1)	*	(0)	0	*
	(658)		(458)		(1116)

*Less than 1 per cent

Table 6

Sum of Activities and Services per Number and Per Cent of Target Group Parents by School Level, 1970-1971 Combined Percentages

Sum of Services and Activities	Parents of Elementary Level Students		Parents of Secondary Level Students		Combined 1971-72 Total	Combined 1970-71 Total
	(N)	Per Cent	(N)	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent
None	(56)	8	(113)	25	15	37
One	(88)	13	(95)	21	16	26
Two	(121)	18	(73)	16	17	17
Three	(155)	24	(70)	15	20	11
Four	(91)	14	(40)	9	12	5
Five	(65)	10	(19)	4	8	2
Six	(22)	3	(15)	3	3	2
Seven	(20)	3	(8)	2	2	*
Eight	(12)	2	(8)	2	2	*
Nine	(8)	1	(0)	0	1	*
Ten	(6)	1	(3)	1	1	0
Eleven	(4)	1	(5)	1	1	0
Twelve	(2)	*	(1)	*	*	0
Thirteen	(3)	*	(6)	1	1	0
Fourteen	(2)	*	(2)	*	*	0
Fifteen	(2)	*	(1)	*	*	0
Sixteen	(1)	*	(0)	0	*	*
Total (N)	(658)		(458)		(1116)	(734)

*Less than 1 per cent

Table 7

Number and Per Cent of Target Group Parents who Participated in or Were Recipients of Various Activities and Services by Activity and Service Category and School Level; 1970-1971 Percentage Total[1] By Corresponding Activity and Service Categories

Activities and Services	Elementary Level Students (N)	Elementary Level Students Per Cent	Secondary Level Students (N)	Secondary Level Students Per Cent	Combined 1971-72 Total Per Cent	Combined 1970-71 Total Per Cent
School Visitation						
Classroom Observation	(123)	19	(33)	7	14	10
Student Disciplinary Problem	(152)	23	(130)	28	25	17
Student Academic Performance	(173)	26	(93)	20	24	15
Regular Parent-Teacher Conference	(416)	63	(194)	42	55	32
Participation in School-Based Activities						
Ceremonies, Parties, Socials, Festivals, etc.	(169)	26	(71)	16	22	13
Volunteer Service (Homeroom Mother, etc.)	(48)	7	(29)	6	7	3
PTA Meetings	(184)	28	(49)	11	21	12
School Advisory Council and Similar Groups	(95)	14	(61)	13	14	5
Workshops	(37)	6	(42)	9	7	2
Training Groups	(16)	2	(7)	2	2	
Non-School Based-Activities						
Community Groups	(76)	12	(59)	13	12	1
Youth-Serving Organizations	(17)	3	(29)	16	4	3
Home Meeting	(40)	6	(11)	2	4	7

Table 7 (Cont.)

Activities and Services	Elementary Level Students (N)	Elementary Level Students Per Cent	Secondary Level Students (N)	Secondary Level Students Per Cent	Combined Total Per Cent	Combined 1970-71 Total Per Cent
Educational Improvement						
Enrollment in READ Program	(15)	2	(4)	1	2	*
Enrollment in a Community College	(6)	1	(7)	2	1	*
Other Improvement Activities	(21)	3	(4)	1	2	*
Visits by School Personnel						
Teacher	(50)	8	(19)	4	6	
Attendance Officer	(105)	16	(97)	21	18	7
All Others	(271)	41	(146)	32	37	
Medical Services						
Medical Examination	(28)	4	(1)	*	2	0
Treatment (including psychiatric consultation, nurse visitation)	(23)	3	(1)	*	2	0
Prosthesis	(0)	0	(0)	0	0	0
Agency Contacts						
Family Oriented Agencies (ADC,MCHRD), YMCA, AA, Emergency Family Counseling, Welfare, etc.)	(47)	7	(26)	6	6	
Other Agency Contacts	(51)	8	(15)	3	6	
Total N	(658)		(458)		((1126)	(734)

[1]Combined Elementary and Secondary level Students
*Less than 1 per cent

Overall, the percentage of parent participation increased from 63 per cent, in 1970-1971, to 85 per cent in 1971-1972, based on the data presented in Table 6. Furthermore, in comparing the elementary level total (1971-1972) with the combined 1970-1971 total (the majority are parents of elementary level students), the increase is from 63 per cent to 92 per cent. With regard to activities directly related to school affairs--the first, second, and fourth groups of categories displayed in Table 7,[1] there is an increase in percentage of participation per category. This also obtains when combined school-year totals are compared or the elementary percentages (1971-1972) are compared with the percentages for the 1970-1971 combined totals. For activities associated with parents' competency to deal with problems or wider community involvements, there is evidence of more Agent effectiveness in the current school year over last year, yet the size of the percentages for the various activity categories are indeed meager.

Student Tutoring

Table 8 presents a summary of information on the tutorial services received by target group students during the current school year. Approximately the same percentage of target group students received tutorial services during the 1971-1972 school year as did target group student during the 1970-1971 school year: 38 per cent, although the number of such students increased in 1971-1972. Of interest in the data displayed in Table 8 is the observation that elementary level students on an average show a greater percentage of participation, are tutored more hours per week, for more weeks during the year and are more likely to have one tutorial service extended for two rather than one semester.

[1]See Tables 11 and 12 in the appendix for a breakdown of parent activities organized by Agent schools for the 1971-1972 school year.

Table 8

Number and Per Cent of Total Target Group Students Receiving Tutorial Services, Number of Semesters Tutored, Means of Number of Weeks and Hours Per Week of Tutoring by School Level

School Level	Students Who Received Tutorial Services N	Per Cent of Target Group	Subjects In Which Students Were Tutored (Number of Students)[1]	Number of Semesters of Tutoring[2] Per Cent One	Both	Weeks of Tutoring Mean (N)	Hours per Week of Tutoring Mean (N)
Elementary	325	49.4	Reading (155) Math (9) Reading and Math (126) Other (2)	58 (18)	261 (82)	21.4 (319)	1.9 (317)
Secondary	105	26.4	English (82) Math (9) English and Math (13) Other (1)	42 ((41)	61 (59)	17.9 (100)	1.6 (103)

[1]Information was provided for 292 Elementary Level Students.

[2]Information was provided for 319 Elementary Level Students, 103 Secondary Level Students.

Recommendations

With the principal emphasis of stated objectives centering on raising academic achievement among school populations served by ESEA Title I programs, any articulation of recommendations derived from an assessment of the correspondence between various aspects of School Community Agents program's operations and scope and the criterion of posttest gain in reading and math must wait until an analysis of the total sample of ESEA Title I test results is completed. This is said with no intention of neglecting the apparent success in posttest gains as evidenced among the 20 per cent sample members reported above. But before any statement can be made identifying what appears to be working and what appears not to be working, among the variety of activities and services provided target group students as well as among the variety of activities and services provided parents by the Agents working independently and through the local educational team, a more detailed analysis of the data is in order.

Lacking this, but relying upon the frequencies reported in the body of this report, it would appear that more emphasis could be placed upon involving more of the parents of target group students in the range of activities and services listed above.

A salient component of the program's operation is the local educational team. Although no attempt was made to gather data relating to its composition and operation, remarks from Agents throughout the school year would indicate that the success of the Agent's efforts were tied by varying degrees to the efficiency and commitment of individual team members. Since the evaluation designs for the 1972-1973 school year have been extended to include process data, the functioning of the local educational team will be a part of next year's report.

DS:dc
10-72

A P P E N D I X

Table 9

Per Cent of Elementary Level Target Group Students who Participated In or Were Recipients of Various Activities and Services by School and Activity and Service Categories

Elementary Level Schools	Number of Target Group Students	Activities and Services: Teacher Helper	Organized School-wide Service	School Club Participation	School Assembly, Science Fair, Police Circus, etc.	After School Reading Program, Home Tutoring	Group worker counseling	Participation in a Treatment Group	Psychological Testing
Balch	33	58	12	15	97	3	12	97	3
Burton	23	9	35	22	0	0	0	0	0
Chaney	21	48	0	0	81	0	0	0	10
Couzens	34	9	6	6	18	0	3	0	0
Campbell	36	0	0	14	3	3	0	28	8
Dwyer	20	15	5	15	10	0	15	5	35
Edmonson	16	56	6	0	81	19	38	31	44
Ferry	19	5	10	21	0	0	0	0	5
Franklin	47	57	4	30	15	23	6	0	2
George	22	0	0	0	91	0	0	0	0
Kennedy	20	0	25	15	0	0	5	5	20
Moore	19	95	5	47	32	37	5	10	5
Owen	18	11	44	6	11	6	17	0	39
Williams	33	15	18	0	15	0	18	0	0
Bellevue	39	0	30	0	62	5	0	18	0
Duffield	75	0	3	0	24	0	95	61	5
Harris	49	82	4	26	39	6	6	16	0
Jones	29	3	0	28	0	0	0	0	3
Keating	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pingree	40	28	0	8	28	0	0	0	0
Scripps	32	25	56	91	0	0	0	0	0
Per Cent		24	11	16	28	4	16	17	6
Number	(658)	(159)	(74)	(104)	(183)	(29)	(102)	(112)	(39)

Table 9 (Cont.)

Per Cent of Elementary Level Target Group Students who Participated....

Elementary Level Schools	Activities and Services								
	Other Diagnostic Services	Various Counseling Services: Social Worker, Personal	Spectator at a Sports Event	Participant in a Sports Activity	Parent-Student Dinner, School Dance	Weekend Trip, Camp, Bob-Lo Outing, etc.	Formal Organizational Participation	Medical Examination (Including Vision Screening, etc.)	Treatment (Including Speech and Hearing)
Balch	3	32	67	39	21	6	3	0	0
Burton	0	9	0	26	0	13	22	4	9
Chaney	0	0	0	0	0	76	5	14	0
Couzens	0	0	0	0	26	44	12	35	6
Campbell	11	29	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
Dwyer	5	5	90	90	0	5	0	30	100
Edmonson	19	0	62	44	50	69	0	38	6
Ferry	0	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	0
Franklin	2	26	51	2	2	38	2	61	8
George	0	0	0	100	0	14	0	100	0
Kennedy	5	5	15	0	70	90	5	5	0
Moore	10	53	5	32	5	79	0	32	10
Owen	0	7	6	6	0	0	7	6	0
Williams	0	0	18	18	39	39	15	24	3
Bellevue	0	51	23	3	0	0	0	14	5
Duffield	1	81	0	0	0	15	55	0	0
Harris	0	6	16	20	35	12	0	94	0
Jones	0	0	0	3	0	100	0	100	7
Keating	0	0	94	91	0	0	0	0	3
Pingree	0	2	0	28	0	85	18	0	0
Scripps	0	22	31	16	69	97	12	6	0
Per Cent	2	25	22	21	14	34	11	28	6
(Number)	(14)	(163)	(143)	(141)	(93)	(226)	(71)	(182)	(37)

Table 9 (Cont.)

Per Cent of Elementary Level Target Group Students who Participated...

Elementary Level Schools	Activities and Services							
	Prosthesis (Including Eye Glasses	Dental Examination	Treatment	Prosthesis	Ad-Hoc School Activities (Bake Sale, car wash, etc.)	Extra-curricular special classes (sewing, career Guidance, etc.)	Recipient of Gifts, Clothing, Food	Miscellaneous Activities
Balch	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burton	0	9	9	0	0	0	0	0
Chaney	5	71	0	0	0	0	0	0
Couzens	0	0	6	0	15	24	0	0
Campbell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dwyer	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Edmonson	12	62	50	0	0	38	25	81
Ferry	0	0	0	0	0	58	0	0
Franklin	2	77	6	0	0	4	0	4
George	0	0	0	0	68	9	0	0
Kennedy	0	75	55	0	60	25	0	20
Moore	16	16	0	0	0	5	0	0
Owen	11	0	0	6	0	6	0	39
Williams	0	9	36	0	0	12	0	0
Bellevue	3	62	18	0	3	0	3	3
Duffield	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Harris	0	4	89	0	0	0	0	0
Jones	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	48
Keating	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pingree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Scripps	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	41
Per Cent	2	24	13	2	5	6	1	11
Number	(16)	(155)	(84)	(1)	(33)	(43)	(5)	(75)

Table 10

Per Cent of Secondary Level Target Group Students who Participated in or Were Recipients of Various Activities and Services by School and Activity and Service Categories

Secondary Level Schools	Number of Target Group Students	Activities and Services: Teacher Helper	Organized School-wide Service	School Club Participation	School Assembly, Science Fair, Police Circus, etc.	After School Reading Program, Home Tutoring	Group Worker Counseling	Participation in a Treatment Group	Psychological Testing
Hutchins	29	7	3	28	48	7	17	3	0
Jefferson	24	67	0	0	79	0	0	0	0
Knudsen	42	2	0	33	0	0	0	0	0
Pelham MS	25	20	20	84	96	0	0	4	0
Sherrard	64	6	11	44	80	0	20	5	11
Spain	50	2	0	10	90	2	26	0	10
Murray-Wright	18	0	0	0	67	0	0	0	0
Northeastern	13	0	0	23	62	0	0	0	0
Northern	29	3	0	34	7	0	0	0	0
McMichael	22	9	4	41	4	0	0	0	0
Cleveland	28	25	0	34	36	0	0	0	11
Barbour	37	5	3	3	16	22	0	0	3
Miller	65	2	0	3	98	0	0	0	0
King, M.L.	12	33	17	3 +	83	0	0	0	0
Per Cent		10	4	23	58	2	7	2	4
Number	(458)	(46)	(17)	(106)	(267)	(11)	(31)	(9)	(16)

Table 10 (Cont.)

Secondary Level Schools	Activities and Services							
	Other Diagnostic Services	Various counseling services: Social worker, Personal	Spectator at a Sports Event	Participated in a Sports Activity	Parent-student Dinner, school dance	Weekend, Trip, Camp, Bob-Lo Outing, etc.	Formal Organizational Participation	Medical Examination (Including Vision Screening, etc.)
Hutchins	0	0	21	24	10	3	28	3
Jefferson	0	0	79	12	58	79	21	75
Knudsen	0	2	2	12	5	2	0	19
Pelham MS	0	96	100	40	96	76	4	72
Sherrard	8	12	70	58	75	33	20	42
Spain	0	4	72	28	28	20	10	8
Murray- Wri.	0	0	61	0	39	0	6	0
Northeastern	0	0	69	8	38	8	8	0
Northern	17	93	7	14	7	0	7	0
McMichael	0	0	18	41	12	9	9	0
Cleveland	4	7	46	11	54	4	0	79
Barbour	0	0	19	14	0	0	5	3
Miller	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
King, M.	0	25	100	25	83	8	25	8
Per Cent	2	15	41	22	32	17	9	28
Number	(11)	(67)	(190)	(101)	(148)	(76)	(43)	(129)

Table 10 (Cont.)

Secondary Level Schools	Activities and Services							
	Treatment (Including Speech and Hearing)	Prosthesis (including Eye Glasses)	Dental Examination	Treatment	Prosthesis	Ad-Hoc School Activities (Bake Sale, Car Wash, etc.	Extra-Curricular Special Classes (Sewing Career Guidance, etc.)	Miscellaneous Activities
Hutchins	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0
Jefferson	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0
Knudsen	0	0	0	0	0	26	2	33
Pelham MS	20	8	12	20	4	48	4	96
Sherrard	25	6	11	14	0	0	0	0
Spain	2	6	0	0	0	18	0	56
Murray-Wright	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northeastern	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northern	0	0	0	0	0	14	10	24
McMichael	0	0	0	0	0	41	100	23
Cleveland	7	25	68	64	4	0	0	0
Barbour	0	0	3	3	0	0	3	0
Miller	0	0	7	0	0	47	0	2
King, ML	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0
PerCent	5	4	9	7	1	17	6	17
Number	(24)	(16)	(42)	(33)	(3)	(78)	(28)	(80)

Table 11

Per Cent of Elementary Level Target Group Parents who Participated in or Were Recipients of Various Activities and Services By School and Activity and Service Categories

Elementary Level Schools	Activities and Services							
	School Visitation Classroom Observation	Student Disciplinary Problem	Student Academic Performance	Regular Parent-Teacher Conference	School-Based Act. Ceremonies, Parties, Socials, Festivals, etc.	Volunteer Service (Home-room Mother, etc.)	PTA Meetings	School Advisory Council and Other Similar Groups
Balch	18	15	18	54	85	21	18	18
Burton	0	13	0	17	0	0	9	26
Chaney	43	62	62	48	24	14	24	24
Couzens	56	3	0	88	71	0	47	12
Campbell	3	0	8	100	0	3	0	17
Dwyer	0	50	5	40	0	0	0	0
Edmonson	0	31	0	69	25	0	19	25
Ferry	0	16	0	0	16	0	0	21
Franklin	13	40	60	64	40	19	40	15
George	18	18	0	96	23	0	96	73
Kennedy	0	70	40	75	50	25	55	60
Moore	32	58	84	100	5	26	53	26
Owen	0	39	11	11	28	6	6	22
Williams	15	18	15	64	48	0	3	0
Bellevue	0	13	80	100	3	3	0	5
Duffield	0	0	35	97	0	0	25	8
Harris	74	14	4	35	33	8	76	6
Jones	3	14	3	93	14	14	10	10
Keating	91	91	91	9	0	0	0	0
Pingree	0	2	0	2	8	20	0	5
Scripps	0	12	3	97	78	0	84	0
Per Cent	19	23	26	63	26	7	28	14
Number	(123)	(152)	(173)	(416)	(169)	(48)	(184)	(95)

Table 11 (Cont.)

Elementary Level Schools	Activities and Services						
	Workshops	Training Groups	Non-School-Based Activities: Community Groups	Youth-Serving Organizations	Home Meeting	Educational Improvement: Enrollment in READ Program	Enrollment in a Community College
Balch	21	18	18	3	12	0	0
Burton	35	26	4	22	0	0	0
Chaney	0	0	19	5	48	0	0
Couzens	6	0	3	0	0	0	0
Campbell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dwyer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Edmonson	6	0	6	0	6	0	0
Ferry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	13	4	28	4	11	8	4
George	0	0	64	4	0	46	0
Kennedy	5	0	10	0	5	0	0
Moore	5	0	30	0	0	0	16
Owen	16	0	11	17	0	0	0
Williams	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bellevue	5	0	0	0	33	0	0
Duffield	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Harris	6	2	10	2	2	0	0
Jones	3	3	7	3	3	3	3
Keating	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pingree	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scripps	0	0	53	6	3	0	0
PerCent	6	2	12	3	6	2	1
Number	(37)	(16)	(76)	(17)	(40)	(15)	(6)

Table 11 (Cont.)

Elementary Level Schools	Activities and Services					
	Other Improvement Activities	Visits by School Personnel: Teacher	Attendance Officer	All Others	Medical Services: Medical Examination	Treatment (Including Psychiatric Consultation, Nurse Visitation
Balch	3	15	48	79	0	0
Burton	26	26	65	87	0	0
Chaney	0	19	57	0	14	0
Couzens	3	3	0	97	0	0
Campbell	0	0	0	19	0	0
Dwyer	0	5	45	75	0	0
Edmonson	0	12	6	75	6	0
Ferry	0	5	90	79	0	21
Franklin	8	38	43	66	40	23
George	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kennedy	0	5	20	65	15	15
Moore	0	16	16	16	5	5
Owen	11	0	6	11	0	0
Williams	0	15	0	9	0	0
Bellevue	13	0	0	95	3	5
Duffield	0	0	0	8	0	0
Harris	2	6	4	0	0	0
Jones	3	0	17	100	0	0
Keating	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pingree	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scripps	0	0	0	59	0	3
Per Cent	3	8	16	41	4	3
Number	(21)	(50)	(105)	(271)	(28)	(23)

Table 11 (Cont.)

Elementary Level Schools	Activities and Services	
	Agency Contacts	
	Family oriented Agencies (ADC, Welfare, AA, etc.)	Other Agency Contacts
Balch	0	0
Burton	13	0
Chaney	0	0
Couzens	0	35
Campbell	0	0
Dwyer	0	0
Edmonson	75	50
Ferry	5	0
Franklin	28	6
George	0	0
Kennedy	0	0
Moore	0	5
Owen	0	0
Williams	0	3
Bellevue	33	3
Duffield	0	17
Harris	0	0
Jones	10	0
Keating	0	0
Pingree	0	7
Scripps	6	28
Per Cent	7	8
Number	(47)	(51)

Table 12

Per Cent of Secondary Level Target Group Parents who Participated in or Were Recipients of Various Activities and Services by School and Activity and Service Categories

Secondary Level Schools	Activities and Services							
	School Visitation Classroom Observation	Student Disciplinary Problems	Student Academic Performance	Regular Parent-Teacher Conf.	School Based Act. Ceremonies, Parties Socials, Festivals etc.	Volunteer Service (Homeroom mother, etc.)	PTA Meetings	School Advisory Council and Other Similar Groups
Hutchins	14	14	34	55	21	14	21	14
Jefferson	0	0	0	58	62	0	0	17
Knudsen	0	0	0	29	0	0	0	0
Pelham MS	96	76	68	100	84	72	80	48
Sherrard	2	61	23	53	9	6	2	20
Spain	2	32	40	38	36	2	2	14
Murray-Wright	0	0	0	89	0	0	0	61
Northeastern	0	31	23	85	8	0	0	38
Northern	3	17	21	3	0	0	0	0
McMichael	9	54	64	86	9	4	27	4
Cleveland	0	68	0	36	0	4	18	0
Barbour	0	11	3	;4	3	0	0	0
Miller	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	2
King, M.L.	0	67	58	100	0	0	67	17
Per Cent	7	28	20	42	16	6	10	13
Number	(33)	(130)	(93)	(194)	(71)	(29)	(48)	(61)

Table 12 (Cont.)

Secondary Level Schools	Activities and Services							
	Workshops	Training Groups	Non-School-Based Activities: Community Groups	Youth-Serving Organizations	Home Meeting	Educational Improvement: Enrollment in READ Program	Enrollment in a Community College	Other Improvement Activities
Hutchins	3	0	3	8	0	0	0	0
Jefferson	54	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Knudsen	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pelham MS	80	28	92	88	4	0	16	4
Sherrard	0	0	12	3	0	0	0	0
Spain	6	0	28	0	4	0	0	0
Murray-Wright	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northeastern	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northern	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0
McMichael	9	0	4	4	0	0	0	0
Cleveland	0	0	7	0	0	7	7	4
Barbour	0	0	16	5	0	0	0	3
Miller	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
King, M.L.	0	0	17	0	67	8	0	0
Per Cent	9	2	13	6	2	1	2	1
Number	(42)	(7)	(59)	(29)	(11)	(8)	(7)	(4)

Table 12 (Cont.)

	Activities and Services						
	Visits by School Personnel: Teacher	Attendance Off.	All Others	Medical Services: Medical Exam.	Treatment (Including Psychiatric Consultations, Nurse Visitation)	Agency Contacts: Family Oriented Agencies (ADC, Welfare, AA, etc.	Other Agency Contacts
Hutchins	10	17	10	0	0	3	0
Jefferson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knudsen	0	0	9	0	0	0	17
Pelham MS	0	12	0	0	0	92	16
Sherrard	5	42	83	0	0	0	0
Spain	14	52	28	0	0	2	2
Murray-Wright	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
Northeastern	0	54	23	0	0	0	0
Northern	10	34	97	0	0	0	0
McMichael	14	36	14	4	0	4	4
Cleveland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barbour	0	11	3	0	0	0	0
Miller	0	0	46	0	0	0	0
King, M.L.	0	50	50	0	8	0	0
Per Cent	4	21	32	2	2	6	3
Number	(19)	(97)	(145)	(1)	(1)	(26)	(5)